

iss) medication, like epinephrine auto-injectors. Today, according to the Allergy and Asthma Network, Mothers of Asthmatics, a grand-slam of 41 States protect for asthma, 26 for asthma plus anaphylaxis, 4 have legislation pending for both conditions, 4 that already have asthma laws have legislation pending for anaphylaxis, and 1 State is just getting started and has legislation pending for asthma. This is a dramatic upswing for our children.

I am especially proud to report what is going on in Florida. Florida has been inhaler-friendly for years, but now there is legislation pending to include epinephrine auto-injectors. My friend and constituent Karl Altenberger, MD, an allergist in Ocala, FL has been active on advancing this for his patients for years in the Florida State legislature. The bill passed last week and is ready for the Governor.

Just yesterday (May 2nd), the Orlando Sentinel reported that "Girl fights for allergy law as if lives depend on it." In Celebration, a central Florida town, lives 9-year-old Kelsey Ryan. "Severely allergic to peanuts, (she) has never known life without her EpiPen. The dose of adrenaline inside could save her life and is with her at all times: in her classroom, on field trips and during after-school activities.

Now Kelsey has been urging Tallahassee lawmakers to pass a bill that would allow the estimated 100,000 Florida schoolchildren with life-threatening allergies the same access to their EpiPens—also known as epinephrine auto-injectors.

Kelsey has testified before four Tallahassee committees since February, meeting lawmakers and passing out practice injectors with tags urging them to pass the bill." We might call Kelsey a true respiration inspiration. She shares that "My mom told me that in some other schools there's children like myself who need their EpiPen with them, but it's locked up far away in the clinic," Kelsey told one committee. "If they somehow needed their EpiPen, it might not get to them in time."

Kelsey's "charisma and dedication led legislators in Tallahassee to rename H.B. 279 the "Kelsey Ryan Act." More than 60 State representatives co-sponsored the bill, which the House passed earlier this month 114-0. The Senate passed it last week and it is on the desk of Governor Jeb Bush.

Brenda Olsen, director of governmental affairs for the American Lung Association of Florida, points out that "Most schools in the State of Florida do not allow students to carry their EpiPens," and, as we have been saying for years, "Moments count when these reactions start."

Kelsey's mother, Blair Ryan, emphasizes another point we made in H.R. 2003: This is a "team effort" between the student, the parents, the physician, and the school. If a parent and physician believe that a student is mature and competent to treat him or herself, a school should not impede this medical regimen, but help it work for the student. Currently, school districts across Florida vary on their policies, and some may not well-serve a student who just accidentally got stung by a bee, or ate a cookie with an unknown walnut. In the Sentinel article, officials in Volusia and Orange counties said the majority of EpiPens are kept locked in school clinics. This could prove to be just disastrous, for the student's health, and potentially as a lawsuit to the school.

I am pleased with the strong momentous progress of this issue here in our Nation's

capital and in our statehouses. I invite everyone to join us in the Cannon Caucus room tomorrow at 11:30 a.m. for a Congressional Briefing, followed by free asthma screenings and asthma health exhibits from 1-2:30 p.m. This year's Asthma Awareness Day is truly a breath of fresh air.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow in the Committee on Rules and on Thursday on the House floor under the able leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, we will be considering and voting with, I am sure, strong bipartisan support, we will be voting out the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill focused on providing very important assistance to our effort in Iraq, the men and women there, and also aid to the victims of the tragic tsunami that we saw take place last year.

We also are very pleased that included in that legislation is an item which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) made a commitment to last fall that would be there when we were working on implementations of the recommendations from the 9/11 Commission, the intelligence conference report.

To refresh the memories of our colleagues, there were many of us, Republican conferees on the House side especially, who were pushing to include very important border security provisions.

□ 1245

Unfortunately, our colleagues in the other body refused to include those. We went ahead and passed out, again with strong bipartisan support, the legislation that implemented the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, including the establishment of a new Director of National Intelligence and very important measures to increase the size of our border patrol as well as other important items dealing with the issue of intelligence. We were unable, because, as I said, our colleagues in the other body would not include it, to have the border security issues which we are going to be including in this supplemental appropriation bill. Again, Speaker HASTERT made a very good commitment that we would have it on the first must-pass piece of legislation.

Those provisions, Mr. Speaker, are very, very important. They are designed to ensure that driver's licenses do not get into the hands of people who are here illegally. It also is designed to complete the 3½-mile gap in the border fence which exists along the border between Mexico and the United States, between San Diego and Tijuana. We, I

believe, are going to be much better off with these items that are included.

But as we move beyond this issue, it is important for us to also focus on other priorities that we have legislatively to deal with the border security issue. Next week we are scheduled to have a hearing in the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Immigration on H.R. 98, a measure which enjoys bipartisan support. I am proud that the lead cosponsor of the legislation is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), former chairman of the Hispanic Caucus, and we have support from a wide range of Members.

H.R. 98, Mr. Speaker, establishes a counterfeit-proof Social Security card. We know that there are employers out there who are required under the employer sanctions provisions of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act to ask for documents when they are hiring people, a birth certificate, driver's licenses, other things. The existence of a counterfeit-proof Social Security card will make it easier for the employer with a card like this, and they will simply take and swipe this card or call a toll-free number and be able to determine whether or not someone is an American citizen, here on a work permit or what their status is. If they do not have this card, they will not be able to get a job; and if employers hire them, we have increased by 400 percent the penalty for those employers and we call for the establishment in H.R. 98 of 10,000 enforcement agents who will make sure that employers are actually complying with the law and not hiring people here illegally.

The bill is called H.R. 98, Mr. Speaker, because according to T.J. Bonner, the president of the National Border Patrol Council, it will reduce by 98 percent the number of illegal border crossings. So we believe very strongly that implementation of a national counterfeit-proof Social Security card, which is not a national identification card, only required for people who are looking for a new job, is one of the most important ways that we can deal with our very, very important border security issue.

We look forward to the passage of the supplemental appropriations bill here on the floor on Thursday. We also look forward to what we hope to be very, very growing support for passage of H.R. 98.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this last weekend I held a town hall meeting on Social Security in my hometown of Martinez. I must say that the audience was quite stunned to learn that not only was President Bush continuing his drive for

the privatization of Social Security, which would borrow trillions of dollars from the Social Security trust fund and drive it deeper into debt and imperil its opportunities to achieve solvency, but now he was offering something called progressive indexing, which would be a substantial cut in benefits under Social Security to middle-class recipients.

They were quite stunned to learn that those individuals who pay into Social Security every week from their paychecks, every month from their paychecks and all year long from their paychecks, that the President was now suggesting that they should take a cut in their benefits as a way of restoring solvency. They were not just stunned that the President was suggesting this one-two assault on Social Security, but they were also quite alarmed to learn that the President apparently has no intention of paying back the some \$700 billion that his administration has borrowed from the Social Security trust fund, that the trust fund is, in fact, not being honored, the people that pay into that trust fund every year to the tune of some \$160 billion, that that money is now being taken out to use for other functions of the government, whether it is the war in Iraq or whether it is the general spending of the government.

It is very clear that they want that trust fund restored. It is a trust fund. They are paying into it because they believe that that money is going to be put there, loaned to the government, replaced by Treasury bills, but it will be there for their use, for their annuities that they are buying every week when they pay into the Social Security fund.

But that is not what the President is suggesting. The President is suggesting, as he does in the budget that this House passed last week, that he will continue to borrow \$160 billion out of the trust fund and, as he said when he went to West Virginia, it is really not a trust fund, there is no trust there, so apparently he is the first President since we started Social Security who has suggested that he may not pay the trust fund back.

That is just unacceptable to my constituents at the town hall in Martinez. I think it is unacceptable to the overwhelming number of the American public who believe that the reason they are paying into Social Security is so that they can have some level of financial security upon their retirement.

Social Security, for the current retirees, supplies over half of their retirement income. Sure, we all want to make it easier and better and more likely that Americans will save for their retirement. But that has not happened. Hopefully it will happen in the future. But Social Security is a very important part of people's retirements. When they look at the efforts by corporations to get rid of their retirement plans, when they look at the difficulty they are having as middle-class families to save not only for their child's

education but for their retirement, they recognize how important it is that the Social Security trust fund be maintained.

But now this President comes along and suggests that that is not the case, that he is going to put an assault on that trust fund with the privatization of Social Security and then he is going to come along and cut the benefits to middle-class Social Security recipients who have paid into that trust fund throughout their entire working life. I think it is very clear that not only is this plan unacceptable to the vast numbers of Americans who have had a chance to take a look at it, but hopefully it will become unacceptable to this Congress as stewards of that trust fund.

But first and foremost, what the American people want us to do is to stop taking the money out of the trust fund to fund the rest of the government. We have got to honor what we set out to do in 1983 under the bipartisan agreement of Speaker Tip O'Neill, an icon of the Democratic Party, President Ronald Reagan, an icon of the Republican Party, when they sat down and hammered out a bipartisan agreement.

Part of that agreement was to create a trust fund, not some honey pot that any Member of Congress could go into and take out for whatever purpose they want but a trust fund for the retirement of millions and millions of Americans and their families.

It is important that we honor that, Mr. Speaker.

LOWELL STOUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Lowell Stout, a good friend who recently passed away in Hobbs, New Mexico.

Lowell was an attorney there. He moved to the area from Oklahoma after the Dust Bowl days in the 1930s. He always called himself a proud son of a sharecropper from Blaine Bottom, Oklahoma.

Lowell worked his way through school as a roughneck on drilling rigs. He also worked as an oil field roustabout. During the Korean War, he served in the Army. After his time in the service, he returned to Hobbs to practice law defending a variety of civil litigation matters. Later he began to specialize, representing the small guy in personal injury, plaintiff-related matters.

Lowell became a fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers in 1981. He was selected to be included among the "Best Lawyers in America." He was an early inductee into the Joe Roehl Circle of Honor which honors the finest trial lawyers in New Mexico.

I never asked Lowell if he was a Democrat or Republican. I suspect he was a Democrat. We never talked much about politics because we shared a common belief that the family was paramount. Lowell was the parent of Mark and Georgiann. Georgiann and I went to school together and graduated. She went on to San Francisco and lives there today. Son Mark stays in Hobbs. He and his wife Cindy have raised their family there.

The abiding memory of Mr. Stout is that he was always with his wife Liliane. They raised their family in Hobbs. He was a dedicated family man. In these days of partisan politics, I know that many times Mr. Stout disagreed with my opinions, but he frankly encouraged me to do the best that I could. He did the best that he could. I think that we ought to learn by his example: dedication and commitment to family, dedication and commitment to a wife.

Again, I salute Lowell Stout, a great lawyer, a fine human being, a friend and the father of friends of mine and the husband of a friend of mine.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, You are ever present to Your people, especially the young and the most vulnerable of society. As we pray for the Members of the United States House of Representatives today, we strain with eyes of faith to peer into the future. We know, Lord, that even now, You are preparing us for an uncertain age to come. By blessing this country with energetic and intelligent young people who have a clear vision of just what is right and a vibrant awareness of those suffering in the world, You are already providing our Nation with young leaders for tomorrow.

By Your grace, strengthen family life, that our young people mature in love and in freedom. Steeped in religious values, may they embrace the self-discipline and study necessary to achieve personal goals and realize their full potential.

May many young people be open to Your call to serve fellow Americans in public service, raise ethical standards in business, bring greater integrity and